

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 14-22, 24-30 and 32-33 are cancelled. Claims 7, 14, 23 and 31 have been amended and remain in the application. The actions taken are in the interest of expediting prosecution and with no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art. Moreover, the amendment or cancellation of claims herein is without prejudice to pursuing claims of different scope by way of continuing Application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**U.S.C. 103**

Claims 1, 4, 17, 24, 26 and 32 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schober et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,320) in view of Snay et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,678). Claim 9 is rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,180,708) in view of Hunzinger (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,062) in view of Silverman (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,649). Claims 2 and 18 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schober et al. in view of Snay et al. in further view of Menon et al. (US H2079). Claims 8, 16, 25 and 33 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schober et al. in view of Snay et al. in further view of Grille (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0032836). Claims 11, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi, Hunzinger and Silverman in further view of Kondylis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,311). Claims 5, 6, 20-22 and 28-30 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schober et al. in view of Snay et al. in further view of Kondylis. Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-22, 24-30 and 32-33 have been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 7, 14, 23 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7, 14, 23 and 31 have been amended as such.

Summary

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 1/11/2007  
SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 23330

By: /Kevin D. Wills/  
Kevin D. Wills  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 43,993  
Telephone: 480-732-5364  
Fax No.: 480-732-2402  
Email: Kevin.Wills@motorola.com